WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

DER WEG DER PARTEI

IS MAO TSE-TUNG A CLASSIC OF MARXISM-LENINISM?

(From №4 / 1978 of "The Way of the Party" — Theoretical Organ of the KPD/ML)

ISBN: 978-1-4357-7575-6

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
TORONTO 2022

CONTENTS

Did Mao Tse-tung Develop the Theory of Continuing the Revolution Under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat? 11

Even After the Liquidation of the Exploiting Classes, the Class Struggle Continues 24

The Theory of the Struggle of Two Lines 38

Did the Cultural Revolution turn the wheel? . 44

The Fight Against Modern Revisionism 49

The Attitude of Mao Tse-tung and the CP of China to Tito's revisionism 50

The Attitude of Mao Tse-tung and the CP of China to the 20th Party Congress of Khrushchev Revisionists 53

The Attitude of Mao Tse-tung and the Communist Party of China to the New Soviet Leadership after Khrushchev's Fall. 56

On Mao Tse-tung's Criticisms of Stalin 59

Mao Tse-tung's Co-Responsibility for the "Theory of the Three Worlds" 68

Mao Tse-tung is Not a Classic of Marxism-Leninism 77

After thorough discussion, the 5th Plenum of the Central Committee of the KPD/ML took the decision to no longer propagate Mao Tse-tung as a classic of Marxism-Leninism. In this article we want to explain and justify this decision in more detail. First, however, some preliminary remarks.

For some time now, under the guidance of the Central Committee, the question of whether Mao Tse-tung can be considered a classic of Marxism-Leninism has been discussed in all basic units of the KPD/ML. This discussion has been very fruitful. In the course of it it has become clear that our party, with a few exceptions, is unanimously of the opinion that Mao Tse-tung was not a classic of Marxism-Leninism. The Central Committee, when it made its decision, took into account the discussion that had taken place in the Party and utilized its results.

The decision of the Central Committee and also this article are not yet a comprehensive assessment of Mao Tse-tung's work. Such a comprehensive assessment is not yet possible for us today, and therefore we have not yet drawn any conclusions about the totality of Mao Tse-tung's merits, his mistakes and deviations.

The work of Mao Tse-tung must be judged first and foremost according to what successes were actually achieved or not achieved under his leadership with regard to the building of socialism in China, and in what connection today's revisionist policies of the CP of China and the PRC are related to his work. In any case, it is certain that China was not the impregnable bulwark of world revolution that we have regarded and propagated it as. However, the question of what successes have actually been achieved in China with regard to the building of socialism cannot yet be answered precisely.

This article will mainly deal with Mao Tse-tung's mistakes and deviations from Marxism-Leninism. Mao Tse-tung has earned undeniable merits in the struggle of the Chinese people from the yoke of imperialism and feudalism, in the struggle for the victory of the anti-imperialist

democratic revolution. We also think that Mao Tse-tung should not be put on a par with the ultra-right counter-revolutionaries Hua and Teng, who have now completely usurped the leadership of the CP of China and internationally constitute a dangerous section of modern revisionism and counter-revolution.

We confine ourselves in this article to examining three very important questions on which Mao Tse-tung has seriously departed from Marxism-Leninism in theory and practice and has committed great errors. These questions are:

1. Mao Tse-tung's theory on the continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat;

2. The attitude of Mao Tse-tung and the CP of China in the struggle against modern revisionism;

3. Mao Tse-tung's co-responsibility for the development of the "theory of three worlds".

In our investigation, we have relied, among other things, on the writings of Mao Tse-tung that were published only after his death, such as the speech "On the Ten Great Relationships". In our opinion, doubts about the authenticity of this speech, which was delivered immediately after the

20th Party Congress of the CPSU, are not justified. The views that Mao Tse-tung expresses here correspond to those in many other of his writings that were published during his lifetime. Moreover, the speech "On the Ten Great Relationships" has already been published once in the 1960s, although not in an authorized form.

This speech contains heavy attacks against Stalin, but not against Khrushchev revisionism, which had raised its head at the 20th Party Congress. Many of Khrushchev's views are even endorsed. Today, Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsaioping are obviously using this speech to justify the construction of capitalism in China. Nevertheless, in this article we have mainly relied on well-known works of Mao Tse-tung because we think that there is little point in discussing whether or not the speech "On the Ten Great Relationships" and other writings published only after Mao Tse-tung's death are forgeries. Mao Tse-tung's serious deviations and his mistakes are equally recognizable in his well-known works and in the policies that the Communist Party of China pursued under his leadership.

Since the founding of our party, we accepted without critical examination the view propagated

by the Chinese leadership that Mao Tse-tung was a classic of Marxism-Leninism and that the so-called Mao Tse-tung thought was a "creative development of Marxism-Leninism". Temporarily, we even adopted the view expressed by the CP of China that it was the "Marxism-Leninism of our era". As a result, not only was Mao Tse-tung propagated by our party as a classic (including by the emblem in the head of our central organ and our theoretical organ), but we also made a series of non-Marxist, anti-Bolshevik views of Mao the basis of our work and struggle, of party building and of the inner-party style of work and leadership.

The fact that we did not base ourselves on Marxism-Leninism in every respect, and that we partly followed Mao Tse-tung's views, which deviated from Marxism, has caused considerable damage to the party and the mass organizations led by it. For the adoption of such un-Marxist views of Mao Tse-tung, their continued propagation in the Central Organ, the Theoretical Organ, the Organ of the Youth League, in internal documents and writings of the party, as well as in training courses, not only contributed to the theoretical confusion of many comrades, but also en-

couraged deviations from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, which the party, and especially its Central Committee, allowed or itself committed. For example, in the orientation of the party's work toward the proletariat and the class struggle, in the question of party building, internal party democracy, the style of work, the mass line, and so on. It contributed to the emergence of left sectarianism and schematism, and for a long time they could not be properly recognized and combatted.

For example, for a long time we accepted the anti-Bolshevik theory of the "struggle of two lines in the party", presenting it as "a special merit of Mao Tse-tung" and a "brilliant further development" of Lenin's doctrine of party building (e.g., in Theoretical Organ №2/74, "The Building of the Bolshevik Party in the Struggle Against Modern Revisionism"). The adoption of this theory, which assumes that there must by law be a proletarian and a bourgeois line in the communist party, led in our party to a falsification of the Marxist-Leninist principle of criticism and self-criticism and to a certain isolation of the party from the working class and from the class struggle. It was not the problem of the party's success-

ful work among the masses that was often in the foreground of party discussion, but abstract line struggle. Not the improvement of this work was often the goal in the application of the principle of criticism and self-criticism, but the eradication of the "bourgeois line" in the minds of comrades, starting from the false idea of the "struggle of two lines". This led to mistakes in education and training. In the case of comrades who had made mistakes, the militant unity, solidarity and comradeship among the comrades, their love and respect for each other and the trust in the party and its basic organizations were sometimes severely impaired.

The use in the Party's basic and cadre training courses of many of Mao Tse-tung's writings, which were incorrect or did not adopt a Marxist-Leninist stance in everything, created confusion on a variety of political and principled questions that the classics had already clearly and universally resolved. Mao Tse-tung's vulgarization, undue simplification and distortion of various Marxist-Leninist principles also fostered certain bad phenomena in the theoretical and training work of the Party and its Central Committee,

such as eclecticism*, scholastic** and doctrinaire "quotation hogwash", syllabification, and an unserious, unscientific attitude toward the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

The Central Committee of the Party bears the main responsibility for these errors. This systematic equipping of party comrades with genuine Marxist-Leninist knowledge was neglected. Marxist-Leninist, principled boldness and a scientific, courageous attitude were not encouraged. They were often replaced by education in uncriticism and book credulity. Criticisms, such as those that came from the basic organizations of the party or were also voiced by non-party friends, class-conscious workers and progressive people of certain tendencies in the policies of the PRC, the Communist Party of China and Mao Tse-tung, were not seriously pursued. Rather, even obvious deviations from the correct Marxist-Leninist course, as have become increasingly evident in the PRC in recent years, have long been justified or propagated as dictated by "tactical" or "diplomatic" requirements.

---

* Unprincipled combination of different, irreconcilable views

** Detached from life and practice, taught by letter.

In this respect, the serious, thorough assessment of Mao Tse-tung's work from Marxist-Leninist ground is a task of fundamental importance for our Party and its comrades. Not only can the struggle against the revisionist leaders in China today not be waged without such an assessment, but it is also important for raising the ideological-political level of the Patel and I subdivisions, for exposing various mistakes of the past and for continuing the correct revolutionary line of our Party to train clearly in the questions raised.

The lively, committed and high-level party discussion that has taken place in recent months is proof of the great educational and theoretical importance of this work, which the party has undertaken and which must be continued.

In the Marxist-Leninist world movement it is undisputed that Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin are classics. Marx and Engels founded scientific socialism. Lenin creatively developed it and raised it to a new level. Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution. This epoch still exists, therefore Leninism still retains its full validity. Stalin is also a classic of Marxism-Leninism. We will elaborate a little on why this is so. We do this because Stalin has been

condemned by modern revisionists and criticized by opportunists for his alleged major errors.

At Lenin's side he fought for the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia. In the thirty years that he was at the head of the CPSU(B) after Lenin's death, he led the decisive struggle for the defence and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat against all enemies, he led the working class and the other working people of the Soviet Union, the first socialist state in the world, in their great struggle for the construction of socialism. Stalin led the Soviet Union successfully in the Great Patriotic War against the fascist aggressors.

Stalin solved a number of important problems of the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and developed this theory further. He deepened the doctrine of the defence and consolidation of the communist party, as well as the doctrine of the leading role that the party, as the fighting staff of the proletariat, must play in the consistent development of the class struggle, in the implementation and deepening of the revolution in the field of ideology and culture, and in the complete construction of socialist society. Stalin further developed the theory of scientific so-

cialism in relation to the construction of socialism. It was he who elaborated and developed the Marxist-Leninist theory on the national question and the Marxist-Leninist theory on linguistic science. Stalin excellently defended Lenin's legacy, he was the recognized leader of the world communist movement and the world proletariat.

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin did not err in theory or practice on any fundamental question. Where they made mistakes or misjudgments, they corrected them self-critically.

Can the same be said of Mao Tse-tung? Did he really develop Marxism-Leninism or raise it to a new level? Or did he also only self-critically correct his misconceptions, which in his case concerned fundamental issues? Let us go into this question in more detail:

Did Mao Tse-tung Develop the Theory of Continuing the Revolution Under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat?

Mao Tse-tung's views on the defence and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat are generally claimed to be his greatest contribution to the further development of Marxism-Leninism. Thus, for example, in the report to the

9th Party Congress of the Communist Party of China, it is stated that he had

> "*for the first time clearly demonstrated in the theory and practice of the international communist movement that after the essential completion of the socialist transformation of the system of ownership of the means of production, classes and class struggles still exist and that it is necessary for the proletariat to continue the revolution.*"[1]

What is attributed here to Mao Tse-tung, however, was already discovered or further developed by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. To cite just one example: on November 25, 1936, J.V. Stalin delivered his well-known speech on the draft constitution of the USSR. In this speech he addresses the changes in the life of the Soviet Union in the period from 1924 to 1936, which necessitated the drafting of a new constitution. He says there:

> "*Thus, the full victory of the socialist system has now become a fact in all spheres of the national economy. But what does this mean? It means that the exploitation of man by man has been abolished, eliminated, and socialist ownership of the means of production and instruments*

has asserted itself as the unshakable basis of our Soviet society...

"*In accordance with these changes in the economy of the Soviet Union, the* ***class structure*** *of our society has also changed. As is well known, the class of landowners had already been liquidated with the victorious end of the civil war. As for the exploiting classes, they shared the fate of the landowner class. Gone is the capitalist class in industry. Gone is the kulak class in agriculture. Gone are the merchants and speculators in the field of commodity turnover. All exploiting classes have thus been liquidated.*

"*What has remained is the working class.*

"*What has remained is the peasant class.*

"*What has remained is the intelligentsia.*"[2]

Stalin thus clearly assumed the existence of classes even after the liquidation of the exploiting classes, after the imposition of socialist ownership of the means and instruments of production. The liquidation of the exploiting classes does not mean the abolition of classes at all, nor the dulling, weakening or even the extinction of the class struggle. In his March 1937 paper "On the Deficiencies of Party Work", Stalin explicitly opposes this theory. He says there:

"*It is necessary to smash and throw aside the lazy theory that the class struggle must become more and more extinguished with every step of our advance, that the class enemy becomes tamer and tamer as we achieve success. This is not only a lazy theory, but also a guided theory, for it lulls our people to sleep, lures them into a trap, while it gives the class enemy the opportunity to gather forces for the struggle against Soviet power.*

"*On the contrary, the more we advance, the more we achieve successes,* ***the greater will be the fury of the remnants of the shattered exploiting classes*** (editor's emphasis)*, the sooner they will resort to sharper forms of struggle, the more perfidies they will commit against the Soviet state, the more they will resort to the most desperate means of struggle as the last means of doomed people. One must keep in mind that the remnants of the shattered classes in the USSR do not stand alone. They enjoy the direct support of our enemies beyond the borders of the USSR. It would be a mistake to assume that the sphere of class struggle is limited to the territory of the USSR. If the class struggle takes place with one end within the USSR, the other end extends into the territory of the bourgeois states surrounding*

us. This cannot be unknown to the remnants of the shattered classes. And precisely because they know it, they will continue their desperate advances in the future.

"*History teaches us this. Leninism teaches us that.*"[3]

Under Stalin's leadership, the class struggle in the Soviet Union was waged against the remnants of the old exploiting classes, against degenerate elements, against agents of imperialism. This struggle was vital for the socialist Soviet Union. Without the continuation of the class struggle even after the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the dictatorship of the proletariat could not have been asserted in the Soviet Union. It would have been completely undermined or overthrown already during Stalin's lifetime or would have collapsed under the blows of Hitler's fascism. The claim that Mao Tse-tung was the first to clearly recognize that the revolution must continue even under the dictatorship of the proletariat is thus an outright falsification of history.

In fact, the Communist Party of China even explicitly criticized Stalin at first because he stated that even after the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the class struggle would intensify and

must be actively and sharply waged by the masses under the leadership of the party. For example, a fundamental 1956 article of the CP of China states:

> "*Although after the elimination of the exploiting classes and the essential destruction of the counter-revolutionary forces, the dictatorship of the proletariat still has to deal with counter-revolutionary remnants — they cannot be completely eliminated as long as imperialism still exists — the main blow should have been struck against the aggressive forces of foreign imperialism.*"
>
> "*After the elimination of those classes, it should not have been emphasized that the class struggle was coming to a head, as Stalin did, with the result that the healthy development of socialist democracy was hindered. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is absolutely right in correcting Stalin's mistakes in this respect.*"[4]

If the CP of China first followed Khrushchev's revisionist theory of the withering away of the class struggle, Mao's later views on the class struggle under socialism were also a revision of Marxism-Leninism in decisive points.

He believed that throughout the historical period of socialism not only the working class and the class of peasants continued to exist, **but also the bourgeoisie**; at least he assumed the long-term existence of the bourgeoisie as a class under socialism.

In his speech "On the Ten Great Relationships" and in his writing "On the Correct Treatment of the Contradictions Among the People" Mao also deals with the problem of the existence of the "democratic parties" alongside the communist party. He explicitly defines these parties as parties of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie and speaks in this context of "coexistence in the long run and mutual control." For example, his writing "On the Correct Treatment of the Contradictions Among the People" states:

> "*The idea of coexistence in the long run has existed for a long time, but in the past year, when the socialist order was essentially established, this slogan was clearly and precisely formulated and proclaimed. Why is it necessary to allow the existence of the democratic party of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie next to the party of the working class in the long run? Because we have no reason not to pursue the policy*

of coexistence in the long run with all those parties which really strive to unite the people for the cause of socialism and enjoy the confidence of the people... What has been outlined here is the political basis for the possibility of coexistence in the long run between the different parties. Coexistence in the long run between the communist party and the democratic parties — that is our wish, that is also our policy. Whether these democratic parties can exist for a long time depends not only on the unilateral desire of the communist party, but also on whether they acquire the trust of the people. The mutual control of the different parties has also existed for a long time. These are the exchange of opinions between the parties and mutual criticism. Mutual control, which of course is not a one-sided matter, means that the communist party can control the democratic parties and that the democratic parties can also control the communist party. Why are the democratic parties allowed to control the communist party? Because it is very necessary for a party as well as for an individual to hear opinions of dissenters... Therefore, we hoped that all democratic parties would pay attention to ideological reformation and work for long-term co-

existence with the communist party and mutual control to meet the needs of the new society."[5]

First of all, it is not a question of denying in principle the possibility that bourgeois parties can still exist temporarily in a socialist country. This depends on the concrete conditions of the revolution of each country. For example, this may be true in a country that is going through two stages of revolution, the anti-imperialist democratic and the socialist, where bourgeois parties have participated in the anti-imperialist struggle. On the other hand, we know from Albania that there were no bourgeois parties there because of the concrete conditions after the establishment of the people's power.[6] We cannot judge in detail whether and up to what point bourgeois parties had a right to exist in China. In any case, if the socialist order is to be established, as Mao Tse-tung said of China in 1957, it is completely wrong to propagate and practise a policy of coexistence with the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois parties and of mutual control.

A policy of "coexistence in the long term", which is supposed to allow the bourgeois parties to "win the confidence of the people", does not support the building of socialism, but the devel-

opment or restoration of capitalism. "Coexistence in the long run" and "mutual control" thus mean nothing other than class cooperation between the proletariat and the (national) bourgeoisie. The correct Marxist-Leninist policy, on the other hand, is to strengthen the leading role of the communist party in all fields in the course of the struggle for the construction of socialism and the deepening of the revolution, to fight to deprive these bourgeois parties of their basis of existence as well as, lastly, the liquidation of the bourgeoisie as a class. If these bourgeois parties continue to exist, then there remain fighting organizations of the remnants of the bourgeoisie against the dictatorship of the proletariat. The existence of these parties in the "long run" means nothing other than the existence of the bourgeoisie as a class in the long run. Underlying this dangerous view of Mao is the notion that the bourgeoisie would accept or even support socialist construction. Mao himself expressed this thought more often:

> "*The elements of the bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia coming from the old society are in their overwhelming majority patriotically minded. They are ready to serve the socialist fatherland, which is blossoming more and more*

every day, and they know that if they turn away from socialism and from the working people under the leadership of the communist party, they will have no one to lean on and no bright future to look forward to."[7]

This is a complete misjudgement of the class character of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie or bourgeois elements see their greatest opportunities not in socialism but in the development of capitalism, and they rely on the degenerate elements of the communist party and on imperialism to achieve this goal. While the bourgeoisie may pay lip service to socialism or temporarily refrain from open resistance because of the new balance of power, in fact it will go all out to establish not socialism but capitalism.

From several statements by Mao Tse-tung it can be seen that he probably had the whole historical period of socialist society in mind for the coexistence of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat under the socialism that he propagated. For example, in his speech "On the Ten Great Relationships" he says:

"*The communist party and the democratic parties are products of history. What emerges in history also disappears in the course of history.*

Therefore, the communist party will inevitably disappear one day, and it will be no different with the democratic parties."[8]

Mao Tse-tung does not approach the question of the existence or disappearance of the communist party and the bourgeois parties from the proletarian class standpoint. While the condition of existence for bourgeois parties ends at the latest when the bourgeoisie as a class is liquidated, the disappearance of the communist party is a completely different matter. Only when all the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat have been fulfilled, when the conditions for communism, for a classless society, have been created, will the communist party have fulfilled its historical task and disappear.

Mao Tse-tung's views on the existence of the bourgeoisie as a class, at least in the long run, if not for the whole period of history of socialism, are very dangerous. It is completely inconceivable, not only theoretically but also practically, that socialism can be built and triumph without destroying the bourgeoisie as a class and depriving it of the foundations of its existence as a class. As long as the bourgeoisie as a class (and not only its remnants) still exists, there can be no question of

the victory of the socialist social order. For the existence of the bourgeoisie as a class presupposes precisely that the exploitation of man by man still exists, presupposes the existence of private property in the means of production, in whatever form, which serves exploitation. So we see that Mao Tse-tung is entangled here in an insoluble contradiction. When he assumed that it was possible to build socialism without destroying the bourgeoisie as a class, he had in mind the coexistence between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. In reality, however, these two classes are hostile to each other from the beginning, the contradiction between them is antagonistic. After the victory of the revolution, the proletariat establishes its dictatorship in order, under the leadership of its party and together with its allies, to never derail the overthrown exploiting classes, to go over to the attack against all positions of the exploiting classes, to liquidate them as classes and to deprive them of any basis of existence.

Of course, for the Chinese revolution, which passed through two stages, the anti-imperialist-democratic and the socialist, there are some peculiarities for the treatment of a certain part of the bourgeoisie (the national bourgeoisie) that took

part in the anti-imperialist struggle. It is also clear that the bourgeoisie cannot be destroyed in one fell swoop. Even in the USSR or in Albania this was not possible immediately. There can also be temporary concessions to the bourgeoisie, as for example in the Soviet Union during the phase of the New Economic Policy (NEP). But all this does not change the fact that the construction of socialism requires liquidating the bourgeoisie as a class and thus the system of exploitation.

Even After the Liquidation of the Exploiting Classes, the Class Struggle Continues

Even after the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the remnants of the exploiting classes still exist, there are the external enemies, the imperialists, who try to destroy the socialist order by all means. New bourgeois elements can arise, which are a great danger to socialism. The birthmarks of the old society will remain in people's consciousness for a long time. "Bourgeois law" persists as well as the differences between town and country, between physical and mental labour, and so on. There is still commodity production. All this is the basis for the existence of the antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions, both of which

remain side by side even when the exploiting classes have already been annihilated as classes. Therefore, the constant and all-sided struggle for the defence and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the decisive chain link to prevent capitalism from being restored. If, on the other hand, it is assumed that the bourgeoisie will continue to exist as a class in the long run during the historical period of socialism, then inevitably the struggle against the class enemies will be weakened and not waged on all sides, then inevitably the dictatorship of the proletariat will be undermined, the foundation stone for its destruction will be laid. Mao Tse-tung presented the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as a non-antagonistic contradiction. After the founding of the People's Republic of China, Mao Tse-tung did declare that now the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has become the main contradiction:

> "*With the overthrow of the landlord class and the class of bureaucratic capitalists, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie has become the main contradiction in China. Therefore, the national bourgeoisie should no longer be defined as an ambiv-*

alent class."[9]

On the other hand, in his 1957 paper "On the Correct Treatment of the Contradictions Among the People", Mao again wrote:

> "*In our country, the contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie belongs to the contradictions within the people. The class struggle between the working class and the national bourgeoisie generally belongs to the class struggle within the people since the character of the national bourgeoisie in our country is ambivalent. In the period of bourgeois-democratic revolution, the national bourgeoisie was revolutionary on the one hand and inclined to compromise on the other. In the period of socialist revolution, on the one hand, it exploits the working class for profit, but at the same time it supports the constitution and is ready to accept the socialist transformation... The contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class, a contradiction between exploiters and exploited, is in and of itself antagonistic. But under the concrete conditions of our country, this antagonistic class contradiction, if properly handled, can be transformed into a non-antagonistic one and resolved peacefully.*"[10]

Thus Mao Tse-tung revises Marxism-Leninism at a crucial point and takes the stand of class conciliation. It is inconceivable that the bourgeoisie, which still existed as a class in China at that time, could peacefully grow into socialism. This view is revisionist and actually contradicts all experience. The bourgeoisie is fighting a life-and-death struggle to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat and to prevent its own destruction. This corresponds to its nature as an exploiting class. The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is antagonistic, nor can it be transformed into a non-antagonistic contradiction by "a correct treatment". These are revisionist views. In fact, with this assertion, both the "peaceful transition to socialism" and the "peaceful growth of the bourgeoisie into socialism" can be declared possible. This theory of "the bourgeoisie growing into socialism", which had also been put forward earlier by Bukharin, had already been thoroughly debunked by Stalin:

> "*To such nonsense, then, Bukharin's theory leads. Capitalists in town and country, kulaks and concessionaires growing into socialism — Bukharin has stooped to such stupidity. No, comrades, we do not need such a socialism. Let*

Bukharin keep it for himself.

"Up to now we Marxist-Leninists have thought that between capitalists in town and country on the one hand and the working class on the other there is an ***irreconcilable*** *opposition of interests. This is precisely the basis of the Marxist theory of class struggle. But now, according to Bukharin's theory of the* ***peaceful growth of the capitalists into socialism****, all this is being turned upside down, the irreconcilable opposition of the class interests of the exploiters and the exploited is disappearing, the exploiters are growing into socialism... Against whom then shall one wage the struggle, against whom shall one wage the class struggle in its sharpest form, when the capitalists in town and country grow into the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat? The dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary to wage an irreconcilable struggle against the capitalist elements, to suppress the bourgeoisie and to wipe out capitalism by the roots. But when the capitalists in town and country, when the kulak and the concessionaires grow into socialism, is a dictatorship of the proletariat still necessary at all, and if it is necessary, then for the suppression of which class?... One of the two: Ei-*

ther there is an irreconcilable clash of interests between the class of capitalists and the class of workers who have come to power and organized their dictatorship, or this clash of interests does not exist, and then only one thing remains — to proclaim the harmony of class interests. ***Either*** *the Marxian theory of class struggle* ***or*** *the theory of harmony of class interests. One can still understand the 'socialists' of Brentano's or Sydney Webb's ilk who preach the growing of socialism into capitalism and capitalism into socialism, for these socialists are in fact anti-socialists, bourgeois liberals. But one cannot understand a man who wants to be a Marxist and at the same time preaches the theory of capitalists growing into socialism."*[11]

Mao Tse-tung's views on the transformation of the antagonistic contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat into a non-antagonistic contradiction through "correct treatment" and the peaceful resolution of this contradiction are at least very close to Bukharin's revisionist theory. What is meant by the "right treatment"? Obviously, it means protecting the bourgeoisie, it means not to develop the struggle against it and all enemies of socialism on all sides, but just to

give it the opportunity to gather its forces and consolidate its positions. Through training, re-education and ideological struggle, Mao Tse-tung hoped to turn the bourgeoisie — apart from a few counter-revolutionaries — into partisans of socialism.

Mao Tse-tung's central deviation lies in the fact that he did not conceive of the national bourgeoisie as a class enemy in the stage of socialist revolution, but as an ally. Thus, he counted the national bourgeoisie among the people and explicitly states:

> "*The system of dictatorship does not apply within the people. The people cannot exercise dictatorship over itself,* ***nor can one part of the people oppress another.***"[12] (emphasis added).

In other words, the proletariat should not oppress the national bourgeoisie, which Mao calls part of the people. These views of Mao are not only theoretically confusing, but they must inevitably have had decisive effects already during his lifetime with regard to the question of building socialism in China. Although we cannot yet survey them in detail today, it is already perfectly clear that the struggle for the defence and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat was

not waged as Lenin demanded and as it was also waged under Lenin's and Stalin's leadership in the Soviet Union:

> "*The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most self-sacrificing and ruthless war of the new class against the more powerful enemy, against the bourgeoisie, whose resistance has been multiplied tenfold by its overthrow.*"[13]
>
> "*The dictatorship of the proletariat is a tough struggle, bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative, against the powers and traditions of the old society.*"[14]

Mao Tse-tung, on the other hand, was liberal towards the class enemies. In his speech "On the Ten Great Relationships" and in his writing "On the Correct Treatment of the Contradictions Among the People", he set the party the task of weakening the struggle against the counter-revolutionaries, of shifting in general from forms and methods of their violent repression to methods of re-education and ideological struggle. While he still considered it right to execute individual counter-revolutionaries outside the party, he took the view that not a single counter-revolutionary discovered within the party or the state apparatus

— even if he had committed major crimes — should be executed. This could be taken as an encouragement for counter-revolutionaries and enemies of socialism to join the party.[15]

It could be argued that Mao Tse-tung later corrected his class conciliationist views on the national bourgeoisie in practice and also liquidated the national bourgeoisie in China as a class. But this objection is not valid. Going by the statistics, it seems that the bourgeoisie as a class was almost completely liquidated.[16] The crucial question, however, is whether this actually happened or whether liquidation is only on paper. It is known that after the conversion of the factories into mixed state-private enterprises in 1956, the capitalists continued to receive 5 per cent interest for at least ten years. This interest, however, is nothing but a form of exploitation. At the same time, the capitalists almost always received a director's post as well, in addition to a state-appointed director. What possibilities these capitalists had to use the money paid out as interest for their capitalist goals, what privileges they had, about this we still have little material. In any case, at the last People's Congress of the PRC it became clear that the national bourgeoisie and the bourgeois parties

continued to exist. Their representatives, such as "China's greatest national capitalist in the days before liberation,"[17] Jung Yi-jen, explained at this People's Congress what a great role they played during Mao's lifetime. For example, Jung Yi-jen, a capitalist, has been a deputy of the National People's Congress and a member of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference since the early 1950s. He became general manager of the Shensin Textile Company after the transformation of the factory in 1956, deputy mayor of Shanghai shortly thereafter and deputy minister of textile industry in 1959.[18] These facts cannot simply be dismissed as lies.

Mao Tse-tung speaks of capitalists transforming themselves into toilers through labour.[19] We have already pointed out his assessment that the capitalists in China could support socialism as a dangerous illusion. Apparently it was equally an illusion that the capitalists in China had transformed themselves into toilers. Rather, it seems to be the case that the old capitalists in the guise of "toilers supporting socialism" actually continued to be the real masters of the factories in many cases, or often shared this position with degener-

ate elements from the Communist Party of China, and that they also obtained influential positions in the state apparatus and in mass organizations of the PRC. We do not yet have a detailed study of the actual property relations in China during Mao's lifetime, but there is some evidence that the extensive liquidation of the bourgeoisie, as indicated by statistics, occurred only formally, not in reality.

Mao's ideas of coexistence with the bourgeoisie are also clearly evident in the cultural sphere. This is clearly expressed in the slogans "Let a hundred flowers bloom" and "Let a hundred schools compete with each other". Mao Tse-tung spoke at length about this in his speech at the National Conference of the Communist Party of China on propaganda work and in his writing "On the Correct Treatment of the Contradictions Among the People". It says there, among other things:

> "*Should free expression of opinion be allowed to flourish or should it be curbed? This is a question of our political course. The guideline 'Let a hundred flowers bloom, let a hundred schools compete' is fundamental and has long-term, not temporary, application.*"[20]
>
> "*The guideline 'Let a hundred flowers*

bloom, let a hundred schools compete with each other' is not only a good method for the development of science and art, but also, seen on an even larger scale, a good method for our work in all fields."[21]

"*From the dispute of opinion grows the truth. This method is also applicable to the poison of anti-Marxism, for it is only in the struggle with anti-Marxism that Marxism can develop.*"[22]

"*The ideology of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie will certainly be expressed. It will express itself in political and ideological questions by all means. It is impossible to prevent it from coming to the surface, from expressing itself. We do not want to use any means of pressure to prevent it from coming to the surface, but we want to let it come to light: when it appears, we must at the same time confront it and criticize it accordingly.*"[23]

In his speech at the National Conference of the CP of China on propaganda work, Mao detailed this. There, for example, he said:

"*Wrong things can happen at any time; they are nothing terrible. Recently, some bad plays have been put on the stage. Some comrades be-*

came very impatient in the face of this situation. I think there can be some of that; because otherwise, soon you wouldn't have the opportunity to see such things, since after a few decades all the crap that is currently being put on stage will cease to exist in the world. We stand up for what is right, fight against what is wrong, but we do not have to worry that one comes into contact with wrong things."[24]

The views Mao Tse-tung espouses here are un-Marxist. "Don't worry about bourgeois ideology", "freedom of expression", "struggle of opinion", "don't exert pressure". these are all liberal attitudes toward ideologies hostile to and alien to socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time, it is clear that Mao stabbed in the back the forces that were justifiably critical of the "flourishing" of bourgeois culture in China with his motto: a little crap can go a long way. Although Mao Tse-tung gave six criteria for distinguishing "flowers" from "poisonous plants", these were non-binding:

> "*The most important of these criteria are the socialist road and Party leadership... Those who do not approve of these criteria can still put forward their own views for discussion.*"[25]

The working class must by no means allow "a hundred flowers to bloom", to spread the poison of anti-Marxism, but must suppress the spread of bourgeois art, culture and science. At the same time, it must carry out a great work of persuasion to eliminate all influences of bourgeois art and culture among the working people. If one behaves liberally towards bourgeois art and culture, great dangers threaten the dictatorship of the proletariat. For the communist party and the dictatorship of the proletariat there must be only Marxism-Leninism, socialist realism, dialectical materialism, a flower with a hundred blossoms. The bourgeois ideologies, the philosophy of the bourgeoisie must be ruthlessly combatted. This poisonous seed must not be allowed to germinate, but must be ruthlessly and thoroughly uprooted.

But the exact opposite happens when the slogan "Let a hundred flowers bloom" is issued. It is even more dangerous when this directive is not limited to art and culture, but is extended to all fields. The counter-revolutionaries and enemies are encouraged to appear openly, they are allowed to spread their poison and prepare the ground for their counter-revolutionary goals.

The Theory of the Struggle of Two Lines

For the victory of the revolution, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of socialism, for the struggle to defend and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, the decisive prerequisite is the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist Party. One of the main factors for the party to fulfil its tasks is its steel-like ideological and organizational unity. If this unity does not exist, if factional currents and opposing, anti-Marxist lines develop within the party, there is a danger that the party will perish or degenerate revisionistically.

> "*All once Marxist-Leninist parties that have so far perished or degenerated revisionistically perished or became revisionist because they deviated from Marxist-Leninist principles and allowed opposing lines and anti-Marxist factionalist currents to emerge and operate within them, and were unable to combat and liquidate them.*"[26]

Therefore, the existence of two lines in the party must not be allowed. Mao Tse-tung, on the other hand, maintained that by law there are always two lines in the party, indeed that the strug-

gle of the "two lines" is precisely the law of the party's development.

> "*Outside a party,*" *Mao Tse-tung wrote,* "*other parties exist, within a party groupings exist; this has always been the case.*"[27]
>
> "*Each grouping forms the wing of a class.*"[28]

Mao Tse-tung's thesis of the bourgeoisie sitting in the middle of the party obviously does not only refer to the concrete situation in the Communist Party of China, but is understood as a general regularity. In the accountability report to the 10th Party Congress of the CP of China it is said:

> "*And the struggle of two lines within the Party, reflecting the contradictions, will continue for a long time. There will be ten, twenty or thirty more struggles of this kind. More Lin Biaos will emerge... This is independent of the will of the people.*"[29]

Many more statements of Mao and passages from fundamental articles or from documents of the CP of China could be cited which assume the lawful existence of a bourgeois line in the communist party. Of course, it is true that there is a danger of the formation of opposing, hostile currents and lines in the party. But the emergence

and formation of such currents and lines is not an unalterable fate. It can be prevented, as the experience of the Party of Labour of Albania shows, if inside and outside the party the struggle against the enemies, against the anti-Marxist views, against the distortions of the directives, norms and principles of the party is waged uninterruptedly and with revolutionary methods. In fact, this struggle must be waged relentlessly and with all consequences. It will be waged ideologically, but at the same time it must be waged politically and organizationally. When anti-party, revisionist elements appear, they must be relentlessly expelled from the party; often it is also necessary to punish them according to their crimes. This is the correct Marxist-Leninist approach. The theory of the "struggle of two lines", on the other hand, is a lazy, anti-Marxist theory. According to the theory of the "struggle of two lines", Mao Tse-tung allowed hostile currents to develop in the party. The traitors Wang Ming and Li Li-san, to name but two, were even allowed to remain not only in the Party but also in the Central Committee, even though their anti-Party activities were well known. Liu Shao-chi's revisionist views had also been known for a long time, at least since the

early 1950s. Nevertheless, he was elected one of the highest officials of the Communist Party of China. Teng Hsaio-ping was even rehabilitated and not even expelled from the party after his recent fall, although it was noted that the opposition to him was antagonistic.

Mao Tse-tung knew that Teng Hsaio-ping was a dangerous revisionist. He rightly said about him:

> "*This man does not tackle the class struggle, he never talks about this main chain link. Still 'white cat, black cat', between imperialism and Marxism he makes no distinction.*"[30]
>
> "*He does not understand Marxism-Leninism, he represents the bourgeoisie.*"[31]

The April 7, 1976 decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to remove Teng Hsaio-ping explicitly states:

> "*The Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China... has come to the view that the essence of the Teng Hsaio-ping question has already turned into an antagonistic contradiction.*"[32]

The same resolution, with which Mao Tse-tung agreed, then goes on to say they:

> "*...allowed him, however, to retain his party*

membership in order to see how he behaves in the future."[33]

This decision is a prime example of the practical effect of the "theory of the struggle of two lines". We now know the consequences of such action. We know how Teng developed. We must assume that in accordance with the example set at the highest level, in accordance with the example that Mao Tse-tung himself set here, this had already been done en masse at all levels of the party — as revisionist, bourgeois degenerate elements retained their place in the party.

The possible objection that Mao Tse-tung's thesis of the bourgeois line in the communist party was only intended to point out the danger of the emergence of revisionist views in the party is an interpretation that is not based on reality. The practice of Mao Tse-tung in dealing with recognized enemies of socialism clearly shows that he actually started from a lawfully existing bourgeois line in the party. We do not accuse Mao Tse-tung of not always recognizing hostile elements as such in time. This is not always possible, and it would also be wrong to immediately fight every dissenting view as a hostile line. Moreover, there are many examples in the international workers'

movement of people initially supporting the revolution and only later becoming renegades. Rather, the criticism of Mao is aimed at the fact that he approved the formation of hostile lines in the party and allowed recognized revisionists to continue working in the party. This is incompatible with the Bolshevik character of any communist party; it must eventually lead to the destruction of the communist party. Lenin, summing up the experience of the Bolsheviks, stated:

> "*If you have in your ranks reformists, Mensheviks, it is impossible to be victorious in the proletarian revolution, it is impossible to assert it. This is obviously certain in principle.*"[34]

And Stalin said on the same question:

> "*The theory of overcoming opportunist elements by ideological struggle within the party, the theory of overcoming these elements within the framework of one and the same party is a lazy and dangerous theory, which conjures up the danger of condemning the party to a state of paralysis and chronic infirmity, of surrendering it skin and bones to opportunism, of leaving the proletariat without a revolutionary party, of depriving the proletariat of the most important weapon in the struggle against imperialism...*

The way of development and consolidation of the proletarian parties leads through their purging of the opportunists, reformists, social imperialists and social chauvinists, social patriots and social pacifists. The party is strengthened by purging itself of opportunist elements."[35]

These views are absolutely correct, and the struggle was waged accordingly in the CPSU under Lenin's and Stalin's leadership. Without this struggle, as Lenin says, the dictatorship of the proletariat could not have been fought and asserted. With regard to the PRC, where this principle was not applied but replaced by the concept of the two lines in the party, which is a new edition of the opportunist theory of "overpowering" the opportunist elements through ideological struggle within the party, this had to have serious repercussions on the development in the PRC already during Mao Tse-tung's lifetime. Today, the Communist Party of China is a bourgeois, revisionist party. Mao Tse-tung, who advocated the theory of the struggle of two lines and thus denied the Bolshevik character of the party, bears a great responsibility for this development.

Did the Cultural Revolution turn the wheel?

In 1966, the so-called "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" began in China. With the launching of the Cultural Revolution, Mao Tse-tung corrected his erroneous view of the withering away of the class struggle under socialism, which he had formulated in 1957 thus:

"*Today the situation is like this: The extensive and tumultuous class struggles of the masses, characteristic of the period of revolution, have essentially been completed, but the class struggle has* ***not quite*** *ended;...*"[36] (emphasis added by the editors).

This false assessment was partly responsible for the fact that enemies of socialism, openly reactionary elements and open revisionists had gained such an influence in the party and state that they were about to seize all power.

The Cultural Revolution dealt a heavy blow to these openly reactionary and revisionist forces, which are back in power in China today. But it is also necessary to make a sober analysis. We must see that — as Mao himself also stated — the Cultural Revolution took place because open reactionaries and revisionists had previously succeeded in imposing themselves on the party and state apparatus. They had been able to do so because, previously under Mao Tse-tung's leader-

ship, serious misjudgements and liberal deviations had allowed these forces to gain ground. These deviations, however, were by no means thoroughly criticized and fundamentally corrected during the Cultural Revolution.

At first, the Red Guards, revolutionary youth, especially schoolchildren and students, and later the army, played a decisive role in the Cultural Revolution. However, the Cultural Revolution did not take place under the leadership of the party (which would have had to be purged) and the working class. This is also expressed in the results of the Cultural Revolution. They did not bring about the unrestricted leading role of the working class. Likewise, the unity of the party on a Marxist-Leninist basis was not established: the right-opportunist deviations, which brought the country into a situation in which the achievements of the revolution hung only by a thread, were not fundamentally abandoned or even eradicated. Although the practical consequences had to be experienced, the dangerous conception of coexistence with the bourgeoisie "in the long run" was not corrected.

The correction of this deviation, however, would have been the prerequisite for being able

to lead victoriously a relentless and all-round struggle for the construction and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This did not happen. Mao's wrong views were not discarded, but only temporarily pushed somewhat into the background, only to reappear later. For example, "On the Correct Treatment of Contradictions Among the People" was never withdrawn, but continued to be propagated as a fundamental writing. The bourgeois parties were not dissolved either, but merely receded somewhat into the background. Thus, the Cultural Revolution in China fought only the effects, but not the causes of revisionist development, and the door remained open for revisionist views and elements to continue their work against the achievements of the Chinese Revolution.

Instead of revealing the causes of revisionist development before the cultural revolution, Mao Tse-tung put forward his thesis that such cultural revolutions should be carried out every seven to eight years. But what does this mean? It means that Mao Tse-tung still assumed coexistence with the bourgeoisie and declared the conquest of the party and the state apparatus by openly reactionary and revisionist elements to be a cyclical regu-

larity. The October 1976 coup of the ultra-right, which provisionally sealed the victory of counter-revolution in China, but also already the formation of these openly counter-revolutionary forces during Mao Tse-tung's lifetime, show the dangerousness of the policy of "coexistence with the bourgeoisie in the long run".

Let us summarize: Mao Tse-tung did not develop the theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The new thing he created in this regard is a deviation from Marxism-Leninism and amounts to reconciliation with the bourgeoisie and the enemies of socialism, was a source of undermining the dictatorship of the proletariat in China. Mao Tse-tung's deviations have had serious consequences in practice. After Mao Tse-tung's death, the open revisionists seized power in China. Revolutionaries in the party, state and army have been eliminated, suppressed or killed. The revisionists are rapidly leading the party and the whole country further and further down the road of the development of capitalism.

When Khrushchev and his clique seized power in the Soviet Union, they had to condemn Stalin completely and took several years to seize

power.[37] In China, things were different. There, the open revisionists and reactionaries around Hua and Teng could partially rely on Mao Tse-tung's deviations and policies and exploit them for their dark goals. The wrong views and the policies corresponding to them during Mao Tse-tung's lifetime have made it easier for China's present revisionist leadership to seize power. Because of these un-Marxist, false views and theories alone, Mao Tse-tung cannot be considered a classic of Marxism-Leninism.

The Fight Against Modern Revisionism

Up to now, our party has held the view that Mao Tse-tung opened the struggle against Khrushchev revisionism and that the CP of China, together with the Party of Labour of Albania, was at the forefront of the struggle against modern revisionism. Today, we cannot maintain this assessment as far as the CP of China is concerned.

It is still undeniable that Mao Tse-tung opposed the Khrushchev revisionists and that in the confrontation with the Khrushchev revisionists many views and concepts of the modern revisionists were unmasked and important principles of

Marxism-Leninism were defended. However, it was wrong to think that the CP of China, under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung, had taken the leading position internationally in this struggle and had consistently defended Marxism-Leninism on all issues. In fact, especially at the beginning of the struggle against modern revisionism, after the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU, as well as later, at the fall of Khrushchev, the CP of China did not stand in irreconcilable hostility to modern revisionism, agreed on many issues even with the Khrushchev revisionists, or even tried to take a "middle position".

The Attitude of Mao Tse-tung and the CP of China to Tito's revisionism

The first great struggle that the Marxist-Leninists waged against modern revisionism after World War II was the struggle against the revisionist Tito clique in Yugoslavia. This struggle was opened by Stalin and the CPSU. With the 1948 resolution of the Cominform Bureau, the counter-revolutionary nature of Tito revisionism was condemned by the whole Marxist-Leninist world movement. After Stalin's death, the Khrushchev revisionists began step by step to re-

habilitate Tito and finally joined with him in a counter-revolutionary front against Marxism-Leninism, against the revolution and socialism. The attitude toward Tito's revisionism was then, as now, one of the core issues for all Marxist-Leninist parties.

The CP of China took a wavering attitude towards Tito revisionism. After the 20th Party Congress, the CP of China published two official documents in April and November, which were drafted on the basis of the discussion of extended session of the Politburo. They are the two articles: "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" and "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat". The first article was explicitly endorsed by Mao Tse-tung, for example, in his speech "On the Ten Relationships". Both were defended by name in the later dispute with Khrushchev revisionism. It states unequivocally in this commentary:

> "*It is understandable that the Yugoslav comrades harbour a special resentment toward Stalin's mistakes. In the past, they made appreciable efforts to adhere to socialism under difficult conditions. Their experiments in the demo-*

cratic management of economic enterprises and other social institutions have also attracted attention..."[38]

Consistently, the CP of China condemned Stalin because, as the articles state, "he, in particular, made the misjudgment on the Yugoslav question."[39] At any rate, Mao Tse-tung and the Communist Party of China were ready at this time to rehabilitate the Tito revisionists; indeed, at this time they contributed significantly to making Tito, who had been exposed as a traitor and lackey of imperialism by the Cominform decision of 1948, once again hopeful, and they overrode this Cominform decision on their own authority.

Even in the later confrontation with the Khrushchev revisionists, this is not taken back. In the commentary "Is Yugoslavia a Socialist State?" from 1963, it says:

> "*In 1954, when Khrushchev proposed to improve relations with Yugoslavia, we agreed to treat Yugoslavia as a socialist fraternal country in order to win it back for the socialist path and to continue to observe the Tito clique.*"[40]

If, on the one hand, it is admitted here that it followed the Khrushchev revisionists on the Yugoslavian question, then on the other hand not a

word of self-criticism is expressed, this step is not condemned, but glossed over and veiled.

We do not want to conceal the fact that the Communist Party of China has also criticized and even harshly condemned Tito's revisionism. But there have been considerable vacillations on this matter of principle on the part of the CP of China under Mao Tse-tung's leadership and these have never been fundamentally corrected. Again, today's revisionist leaders of the CP of China can build on this erroneous and vacillating stance to expand their fraternal relations with the Tito revisionists.

The Attitude of Mao Tse-tung and the CP of China to the 20th Party Congress of Khrushchev Revisionists

At the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU, Khrushchev delivered his infamous secret report against Stalin. This secret report and the whole struggle of the Khrushchev revisionists against the alleged personality cult, was in reality a blow directly directed against Marxism-Leninism and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. The 20th Party Congress propagated the revisionist theories of "peaceful transition to social-

ism", "peaceful coexistence" in the sense of cooperation with imperialism and other revisionist concepts, which contributed to the degeneration of a number of communist parties and socialist countries that adopted these revisionist views. It is an obvious fact that the CP of China under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung did not initially reject this frontal attack on Marxism-Leninism, followed the demagogy of the alleged personality cult of Stalin, partially supported the attacks against Stalin and approved many false and revisionist views of Khrushchev or judged them as minor mistakes compared to the "mistakes of the past" — the alleged mistakes of Stalin.

We cite here only a few of the numerous quotations from the above-mentioned writings attacking Stalin and praising the 20th Party Congress. Thus, among other things, it is said there:

> "*The struggle unfolding at the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU against the personality cult is truly a great, heroic struggle.*"[41]
>
> "*Stalin tolerated and promoted... the cult of personality and practised personal arbitrariness.*"[42]
>
> "*The 20th Party Congress of the CPSU showed great determination and courage by put-*

ting an end to the cult of Stalin, revealing the grave extent of Stalin's mistakes and eliminating their effects."[43]

These statements clearly show that the CP of China at first completely misjudged Khrushchev revisionism, even giving the impression that it was Khrushchev who was defending Marxism-Leninism against Stalin. Later, although the Khrushchev revisionists were exposed on the part of the CP of China, their earlier false views, including the slanderous attacks on Stalin, were not self-critically retracted. Instead, a 1963 writing from the "Polemic on the General Line" on the attacks on Stalin contained in the articles "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" and "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" states:

"*These two articles comprehensively analysed the whole life of Stalin, established the universal significance of the path of the October Revolution, summarized the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat and tactfully but very clearly criticized the false theses of the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU, also refuting the anti-communist slanders on the part of imperialism and reactionaries.*"[44]

This is not a self-criticism that would have opened the way to a consistent defence of Stalin on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles, but a whitewashing of the previously adopted false position.

The Attitude of Mao Tse-tung and the Communist Party of China to the New Soviet Leadership after Khrushchev's Fall

The wavering attitude of Mao Tse-tung and the CP of China toward modern revisionism is also expressed in their assessment of the new leadership of the Soviet Union after the fall of Khrushchev. The assessment of the Party of Labour of Albania on this question was clear and correct. Comrade Enver Hoxha wrote in November 1964, immediately after the fall of Khrushchev:

> "*The fall of Khrushchev is a great success, but it does not mean the end of Khrushchev revisionism in particular, nor of modern revisionism in general... With his departure neither the course and policy, nor the socio-economic roots of revisionism have been eliminated Khrushchev revisionism... is far from liquidated.*"[45]

The commentary published by the CP of

China immediately after Khrushchev's fall instead argues that with Khrushchev's fall, modern revisionism in the Soviet Union was also bankrupt. Thus, the commentary states in "Why Khrushchev Stepped Down From the Stage":

> There was "*the hope that things would continue to develop in the direction set by Khrushchev and that a so-called 'Khrushchevism without Khrushchev' would be possible. One can say categorically that nothing will come of it.*"[46]

And in the paper "Carrying the Struggle Against Khrushchev's Revisionism to its End" of June 1965 it is said:

> "*We pinned hopes on the new leaders of the CPSU, watched and waited for several months.*"[47]

All this clearly shows that the CP of China considerably underestimated the nature and danger of Soviet revisionism. In contrast, Comrade Enver Hoxha, in his 1965 conversation with Chou En-lai, expressed the correct position of the Party of Labour of Albania:

> "*And when the Soviet revisionists saw the great defeat and the great evil coming as a result of our consistent, Marxist-Leninist struggle, they preferred the lesser evil. They stopped their*

leader and ideologist Nikita Khrushchev cold. They indirectly put all the blame on him and, without changing anything in his old line, Khrushchev's cronies, his collaborators and accomplices, stepped on the stage to continue Khrushchev revisionism without Khrushchev.

"*The period after Khrushchev's cold-calling confirmed that the Soviet revisionists are just as much traitors as Khrushchev and follow with the greatest fidelity Khrushchev's treacherous, anti-Marxist theses.*"[48]

Later, the CP of China also fought Khrushchev's successors as revisionists. It would also not be necessary to emphasize so strongly today the wavering attitude of the CP of China under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung if the CP of China had later consistently overcome its wrong views, which would have included an admission of this wavering attitude. However, this did not happen. Instead, the Communist Party of China emphasized that it had always consistently fought modern revisionism, and it gives itself the title of having first and most consistently fought modern revisionism under Mao Tse-tung's leadership. This does not correspond to the facts and covers up the at least temporary vacillation of the Communist

Party of China on important questions of the struggle against modern revisionism.

Thus, the new emperors of China today can directly follow the wrong views that the CP of China took on the modern revisionism of Tito, Khrushchev and Khrushchev's successors. Under the false halo of having been the first and the most consistent to fight modern revisionism, they disguise their path of complete construction of capitalism in China.

On Mao Tse-tung's Criticisms of Stalin

In connection with the attitude of Mao Tse-tung and the CP of China to Khrushchev revisionism, we would like to mention here some important criticisms that Mao Tse-tung made of Stalin's work. We are of the opinion that all these criticisms are wrong.

Anyone who studies closely the speech "On the Ten Great Relationships" and numerous other materials published in Volume 5 of Mao Tse-tung's works can easily see that Mao Tse-tung considered the construction of socialism in the USSR under Stalin's leadership to be wrong on many issues. In the entire speech "On the Ten Great Relationships", which today is praised by

Chinese revisionists as an important work against modern revisionism, it is striking that the main thrust is not against Khrushchev's revisionism, which clearly appeared at the 20th Party Congress, but against Stalin. Stalin is "defended" there against Khrushchev only insofar as it is stated that one should not condemn everything of Stalin, but only 30 per cent. Let us therefore briefly contrast some aspects of this speech by Mao at some important points with Stalin's writing "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR". This writing of Stalin's is a brilliant further development of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the economic construction of socialism. Published in 1952, it is at the same time a sharp declaration of war against the various revisionist concepts as they were later put into practice by Khrushchev and his followers.

1. Mao Tse-tung has expressly welcomed Khrushchev's decision to transfer the machine and tractor stations in the Soviet Union from the ownership of the state to the ownership of the collective farms. He has declared Stalin's refusal to do so and his justification for it to be completely wrong. But what did Stalin say:

"*From this it would follow that, first, the*

collective farms would become owners of the main instruments of production, that is, they would occupy a special position, such as no single farm in our country occupies, for, as is well known, not even our nationalized farms are owners of instruments of production. How can this special position of collective farms be justified, with what arguments of progress and further development? Can it be said that such a position would help to raise collective ownership to the level of general ownership, that it would accelerate the transition of our society from socialism to communism? Would it not be more correct to say that such a position would only widen the gap between collective-farm property and national property and would not lead to a rapprochement with communism but, on the contrary, to a move away from it?

"*Secondly, this would result in a widening of the sphere of action of commodity circulation, for enormous quantities of the instruments of production of agriculture would come into the orbit of commodity circulation. What do comrades Sanina and Venzher think: Can the extension of the sphere of action of commodity circulation promote our development toward com-*

munism? Would it not be more correct to say that it can only inhibit our development toward communism? The main mistake of comrades Sanina and Venzher is that they do not understand the role and importance of commodity circulation in socialism, do not understand that commodity circulation is incompatible with the perspective of the transition from socialism to communism. They seem to believe that since commodity circulation cannot prevent the transition from socialism to communism, commodity circulation can transition to communism too. This is a great error which has arisen from the fact that Marxism has not been understood."[49]

2. Mao attacked Stalin for having placed the emphasis unilaterally on the development of heavy industry. As a result, the construction of the economic basis of socialism as in the Soviet Union had not progressed properly. As is well known, Khrushchev's accusations on this issue were along the same lines. Mao said with regard to the development of light industry:

"*What will result from this increase? First, the population will be supplied even more rapidly; second, money will be accumulated more rapidly, enabling us to develop heavy industry with greater and*

better results. Heavy industry can also contribute to accumulation, but under our present economic conditions, light industry and agriculture can accumulate more and faster."[50]

In other words, Mao Tse-tung puts the profitability of the various branches of industry in the foreground, but neglects the fundamental interest — the creation of a stable and firm economic basis for socialism. Stalin says to similar arguments — arguments that were later also used and put into practice by the Khrushchev revisionists:

> "*It is obvious that if we wanted to follow in the footsteps of these comrades, we would have to renounce the primacy of the production of means of production in favour of the production of means of consumption. But what does it mean to renounce the primacy of the production of means of production? It means depriving our national economy of the possibility of uninterrupted growth, for it is impossible to ensure the uninterrupted growth of the national economy without at the same time ensuring the primacy of the production of means of production.*"[51]

This view of Stalin's is perfectly correct. What would have become of the Soviet Union in World War II if Stalin's path of industrialization had not

been taken? It was the Soviet Union's modern, efficient heavy industry that provided the Red Army with first-class equipment and weapons — a fact that contributed in no small measure to the victory over Hitler's armies.

We can also clearly see from socialist Albania how important industrialization was in order to withstand the blockade of the imperialists and revisionists, to be able to defend the independence of the country and socialism.

3. The struggle to liquidate the kulaks and collectivize agriculture.

Mao accused Stalin of "squeezing" the peasants, of not trusting them, and of using the wrong methods to promote the collectivization of agriculture. But what was it like in reality? First of all, this question is important: which peasants are meant? As for the working peasants, this is a deceitful slander. The working peasants were not squeezed out, but they successfully took the path of collectivization of agriculture in the hard struggle against kulakism. Where mistakes were made in the struggle for collectivization in agriculture, where the struggle was not directed against kulakism but also against middle peasants, it was Stalin who correctly directed the struggle and

criticized wrong measures.[52] Stalin vigorously opposed the ideas of Trotsky, who did not consider the working peasants as allies of the proletariat, but actually wanted to squeeze and oppress them. It is undisputed that the working peasants also made great sacrifices for their Soviet fatherland in order to advance industrialization, to ensure and safeguard the independence of the USSR. But this has nothing to do with "extortion". As for the rich peasants, the kulaks, who constituted the bourgeoisie in the countryside, they were indeed ruthlessly fought and liquidated as a class.

The struggle for collectivization of agriculture met with resistance above all from the kulaks, the capitalist elements in the Soviet village. Without the liquidation of the kulak class, socialist production relations could not be established in the village. Therefore, the party went on the offensive against the kulak class and the class struggle intensified extraordinarily. The "History of the CPSU(B)" states:

> "*The transition to universal collectivization took place not in the form of a simple and peaceful entry of the great masses of peasants into the collective farms, but in the form of the mass struggle of the peasants against kulakism... But*

since a significant part of this land was in the hands of the kulaks, the peasants chased the kulaks off the land, carried out the kulak segregation, took away their cattle and machinery, and demanded from the Soviet power the arrest and resettlement of the kulaks."[53]

Was that wrong? No, it was absolutely right. It was not Mao who was right, but Stalin. Mao's view is right-opportunist and means a weakening of the struggle against the capitalist elements in the countryside. But if by the "squeezing" of the peasants the kulaks are meant, then Mao's criticism is made from the ground of the revisionist concept of "coexistence in the long run" with the bourgeoisie, to which we have already referred.

Mao's accusations about the struggle that Stalin waged at the head of the CPSU(B) for the defence and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat are also false.

Mao Tse-tung accused Stalin of sometimes confusing the two different types of contradictions in the internal and external party struggle. The fact is that Stalin consistently suppressed counter-revolution. Where counter-revolutionary machinations were uncovered, Stalin did not leave them even a hand's breadth to continue

their hostile activity against the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, to the extent that individual exaggerations occurred in the necessary suppression of counter-revolution in the Soviet Union, it was again Stalin who publicly exposed and corrected this in the accountability report to the 18th Party Congress of the CPSU(B).[54] Mao's criticism, however, is that Stalin went too far in suppressing counter-revolution. This is a concession to the modern revisionists.

Mao has also accused Stalin of sometimes distancing himself from the masses and disregarding the mass line. However, the facts show that in the struggle for the defence and consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and for the economic construction of socialism, Stalin always strove to mobilize the masses and indeed did so. The struggle for the destruction of the kulaks and for the collectivization of agriculture was a struggle of the masses under the leadership of the Party. The same is true of the struggles against the Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites and other enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat. With this criticism, Mao Tse-tung also made great concessions to the modern revisionists.

Mao Tse-tung's Co-Responsibility for the "Theory of the Three Worlds"

Our party today has a clear understanding of the so-called "theory of three worlds". We fight it as a counter-revolutionary, revisionist theory which is in complete contradiction with the teachings and principles of Marxism-Leninism. It is directed against the struggle of the proletariat in capitalist countries for proletarian revolution and the building of socialism. It sabotages the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples against imperialism and internal reaction. In socialist countries, it weakens and undermines the dictatorship of the proletariat, weakens and undermines the struggle waged by the working class and its allies under the leadership of the communist party to defend and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat. This theory has been elaborated by the leadership of the CP of China, which is trying by all means to impose it on the Marxist-Leninist parties as a general strategic line. The parties in which the revisionist "theory of three worlds" prevailed have turned into appendages of imperialism, into bourgeois revisionist parties.

Our party used to say that no one can refer to Mao Tse-tung to justify the "theory of three worlds". We have also held that this counter-revolutionary theory was in **complete** opposition to Mao Tse-tung's views. This assessment is wrong. No one would want to claim that the "theory of three worlds" was made the basis of the policy of the Communist Party of China without Mao Tse-tung's knowledge. However, as Chairman of the Party, Mao Tse-tung is responsible for the basic theory and policy of the Party. The "theory of three worlds" would have been difficult to implement in the CP of China if Mao Tse-tung, as Chairman, had waged a determined struggle in the Party to defend the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. However, this was manifestly not the case. In fact, we must assume that Mao Tse-tung helped develop this theory and supported and endorsed the policies justified by it.

The "theory of three worlds" was not elaborated after Mao Tse-tung's death. Its precursors can already be found in 1964-1965 in many articles of "Peking Review" and other writings of the Communist Party of China. There it is argued in several places that the peoples could unite to a

certain extent with imperialist powers in the struggle against the main enemy (this was U.S. imperialism at that time). For example, in the fundamental article "Refutation of the So-Called Unity of Action of the New Leadership of the CPSU(B)" of November 11, 1965, it is stated:

> "*In the imperialist countries that have sharp antagonisms with the USA, besides that part of the monopoly bourgeoisie that obeys the American imperialists, there are also others who want to fight more or less against the USA. The peoples can take joint action with the latter in the struggle against American imperialism on some issues and to a certain extent.*"[55]

As early as **1964**, Mao Tse-tung wrote in his article in support of the Panamanian people against U.S. imperialism:

> "*...all states subjected to aggression, control, interference, intimidation by USA imperialism should unite...*"[56]

Thus it was already said by Mao Tse-tung that in the front against U.S. imperialism belong not only the socialist countries, the world proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations, but also the imperialist and capitalist countries, which were all more or less under the control of U.S.

imperialism. With this view, which can also be substantiated by numerous other quotations, Mao Tse-tung has already laid a foundation stone for the "theory of three worlds".

For example, in the New Year's message of "Renmin Ribao", "Hongqi" and "Jiefangjun Bao" in 1972 — to mention only one example among many — it is said:

> "*More and more medium-sized and small states are uniting to fight against the hegemony doctrine and power politics of the two superpowers, the third world states are playing an increasingly important positive role in international affairs day by day, all the states and peoples subjected to aggression, subversion, control, intervention and humiliation by the two superpowers are now forming a broad united front.*"[57]

At the 10th Party Congress of the Communist Party of China, which took place in August 1973 under the chairmanship of Mao Tse-tung, the "theory of the three worlds", without being explicitly mentioned by name, was already the basis of the accountability report, in which the division of the forces of the world was made according to groups of forces corresponding to those of the "theory of the three worlds". In this

accountability report, for example, there is also open talk of a possible cooperation with the bourgeoisie on a national and international scale. This report was approved unanimously, that is, with Mao Tse-tung's consent.

A year later, the renegade Teng Hsaio-ping publicly and explicitly propagated the "theory of three worlds" for the first time in his speech to the UNO. Contrary to earlier assessments, in which we present the division of forces made there only as a relatively non-committal "picture", all the essential revisionist positions of the "theory of three worlds", which our party later consistently debunked, are already summarized here.

The gradual implementation of the "theory of three worlds" obviously took place with Mao Tse-tung's approval and support. The "theory of three worlds" and its preliminary forms have not only been published in numerous fundamental articles and documents of the CP of China. At the same time, it has increasingly become the guiding principle of the Communist Party of China's policy in international affairs.

As early as 1964, the CP of China adopted a wavering attitude toward French imperialism as its contradictions with the U.S. imperialists in-

tensified. There was a strong tendency in the CP of China at that time to declare the French imperialists, and in particular De Gaulle, who was running the government affairs for them, as fighters for the national independence of France. Mao Tse-tung himself, in his telegram on the occasion of his death, even called De Gaulle an

> "*indomitable fighter against fascist aggression and in defence of French national independence...*"

In contrast, Comrade Enver Hoxha, in his 1965 conversation with Chou En-lai, excerpts of which were recently published, pointed out that while it was right to exploit the contradictions between the French imperialists and the U.S. imperialists, one should have no illusions about French imperialism and its reactionary nature. [58]

The leadership of the CP of China, especially in recent years, has invited the heads of numerous fascist, reactionary regimes from Asia, Africa and Latin America to Peking. This was not just a matter of establishing normal diplomatic relations (and even this must be condemned in many cases, as in the case of the fascist Chilean regime, for example). But the lackeys of imperialism, reactionaries and fascists were celebrated in Peking as

champions against imperialism, for national independence and as leaders of their peoples. They were welcomed by Mao Tse-tung and he shook hands with dozens of them.

In 1972, at the height of the Vietnam War, U.S. President Nixon was invited to the PRC and received by Mao Tse-tung. Even when Nixon was completely washed up in the U.S. and forced to resign as president, he and members of his family were invited to China and received by Mao. All this was an expression of a policy of capitulation to American imperialism, a policy that aimed and aims at cooperation with American imperialism, as is now increasingly evident. The same is true of the visit of Strauss and other open and undisguised reactionary representatives of the monopoly bourgeoisie from West Germany, Britain, Japan, etc. The leadership of the CP of China called all these people "far-sighted personalities". It agreed to cooperate with the Western imperialists, including U.S. imperialism, and even abandoned the struggle against NATO and the EEC. Instead, it supported more and more bluntly the strengthening of the EEC and NATO. This policy was openly pursued even when Mao Tse-tung was alive and chairman of the party. He not only

lent his name to this policy, but obviously supported it.

After the death of Mao Tse-tung, the revisionists in the leadership of the Communist Party of China lost all inhibitions and explicitly declared the "theory of three worlds" as the "new world strategy" and carried out the counter-revolutionary, revisionist policy corresponding to it more and more openly.

Today, we still cannot accurately judge whether Mao Tse-tung himself fully elaborated the revisionist "theory of three worlds" or only certain fundamentals of this theory and the full elaboration into a closed revisionist concept was done by others — or whether Mao Tse-tung "only" adopted this theory from other leading members of the CP of China. However, it is absolutely certain that this revisionist theory was already essentially worked out during Mao Tse-tung's lifetime and that a corresponding revisionist foreign policy was practised and that this was accepted and supported by Mao Tse-tung.

The same applies to the policy of the CPC towards the Marxist-Leninist fraternal parties.

Since the Communist Party of China supported splinter groups against the existing Marx-

ist-Leninist parties in many countries, it became obvious that the Communist Party of China grossly violated the principles of equality of communist parties and the unity of all truly Marxist-Leninist parties. This also happened during Mao Tse-tung's lifetime and would not have been possible without his approval.

We are sure that there will be more revealing statements on how the CP of China treated other fraternal parties, or on the question of why, after the betrayal of the modern revisionists, the international unity of the Marxist-Leninist parties did not advance, why there were no joint conferences of the Marxist-Leninist parties and no successful steps towards a common international organization, as represented by the Comintern or even the Cominform.

We must conclude, then, that Mao Tse-tung departed from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism on fundamental questions of the struggle against imperialism. Of course, it would be wrong to hold Mao Tse-tung personally responsible for every single deviation of the CP of China from Marxist-Leninist principles or to blame him personally for them. But it is obvious that the pronounced

wrong line, which the Communist Party of China had already taken in its foreign policy and in its relations with the Marxist-Leninist fraternal parties during Mao Tse-tung's lifetime, would not have been possible without his consent. These deviations, this line, were serious and had far-reaching and serious consequences. They led to the weakening and sabotage of the unity of the Marxist-Leninist world movement. Today, with its "three worlds" policy and theory, the leadership of the CP of China is completely working into the hands of U.S. imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, the other imperialist powers and the world reaction in its attempt to stifle and extinguish the revolution and liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples.

Mao Tse-tung is Not a Classic of Marxism-Leninism

If we summarize the investigation so far, the conclusion is inevitable: Mao Tse-tung is not a classic of Marxism-Leninism. Today we can and must already state this, even if we cannot yet fully assess Mao Tse-tung's work.

Mao Tse-tung has advocated serious deviations from Marxism-Leninism on fundamental,

crucial issues and has made major mistakes that have had far-reaching practical consequences. These deviations centre on his failure to wage a consistent struggle against the bourgeoisie. He took a wavering attitude towards the national bourgeoisie in the socialist revolution, he justified in theory and practice the retention of bourgeois elements in the party, he supported collaboration with imperialism and its lackeys against the socialist revolution and the national liberation struggle of the peoples by developing or adopting the "theory of three worlds". Today's revisionist development in China cannot be understood in isolation from Mao Tse-tung's work. In many cases, the foundations for today's revisionist policies were laid during his lifetime.

If one were to follow these deviations of Mao Tse-tung, this would also have serious, disastrous consequences for the socialist revolution in Germany. The correction of our earlier assessment of Mao Tse-tung is therefore an absolute necessity in order to keep Marxism-Leninism pure of any false, un-Marxist theories and views and, guided by true Marxist-Leninist principles, to successfully achieve our fighting goal, the united, independent, socialist Germany.

NOTES

(Translated from the German edition)

[1] "Report at the 9th Party Congress of the CP of China", in: "Important Documents of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution", Peking 1970, p. 13

[2] J.V. Stalin, "On the Draft of the New Constitution of the Soviet Union", Works, Vol. 14, Dortmund 1976, p.60.

[3] J.V. Stalin, "On the Deficiencies of Party Work and the Measures for Liquidating the Trotskyist and Other Double-Dealers", Works, Vol. 14, p. 136.

[4] "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", Peking, November 1956, in: "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" and "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", reprinted Munich 1971, p. 55.

[5] Mao Tse-tung, "On the Correct Treatment of Contradictions Among the People", in: "Four Philosophical Monographs", Peking 1968, p. 133 f

[6] In the "History of the Party of Labour" it says: "The Democratic Front was and is a voluntary union of the popular masses from below, but not a coalition of political parties.

"At all stages it was based on the alliance of the working class with the labouring peasantry under the leadership of the working class. Its broadest base was the peasantry.

"The PLA was always the only leading force of the front and the only political party in this front.

"In Albania, in fact, there have been no political bourgeois parties and none were formed after the formation of the CPA. The PLA was not against the formation of other anti-fascist parties or cooperation with them on the question of organizing the struggle against the occupiers, if such had been formed.

"But it fought and destroyed political organizations such as the 'National Front' and 'Legality', which were formed by the landowners and the reactionary bourgeoisie at the instigation and with the support of the Italian and German occupiers, which sought to liquidate the party and the front and to prevent the victory of the people's revolution. Furthermore, the party crushed all efforts which the landlords and the bourgeois elements, encouraged and supported by the American and British imperialists, made after the war to form reactionary political parties so that they could then have used them as a weapon to overthrow the people's power.

"The historical fact that there were no other political parties in the country except the PLA was a very favourable case for the working class, the people, the revolution and socialism in Albania. This circumstance gave the party of the working class the possibility to fulfil more easily and better its mission as leader of the revolution in all stages.

"The fact that the PLA was the only political party in the country helped to better exercise socialist democracy for the benefit of the working masses after the victory of the popular revolt." ("History of the Party of Labour of Albania", Tirana 1971, p. 711).

[7] Mao Tse-tung, "On the Correct Treatment of Contradictions Among the People", op. cit. p. 129

[8] Mao Tse-tung, "On the Ten Great Relationships", in: "Peking Review" 1/1977, p. 20

[9] Mao Tse-tung, "Selected Works", vol. 5, p. 77 (own translation)

[10] Mao Tse-tung, "On the Correct Treatment of Contradictions Among the People", op. cit. p. 92

[11] J.V. Stalin, "On the Right Deviation in the CPSU(B)", Works, vol. 12, p.26.

[12] Mao Tse-tung, "On the Correct Treatment of Contradictions Among the People", op. cit. p. 94

[13] V.I. Lenin, "'Left Radicalism', the Childhood Disease in Communism", Works, vol. 31, p. 8.

[14] V.I. Lenin, "'Left Radicalism', the Childhood Disease in Communism", op. cit. p. 29

[15] See: Mao Tse-tung, "On the Ten Great Relationships", op.cit.p.22

[16] See: Chang Chun-chiao, "On the All-Sided Dictatorship over the Bourgeoisie", Peking 1975, p. 6.

[17] "Interview with the Vice-Chairman of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference", Jung Yi-jen, in: "Hsinhua News Agency", March 16, 1978.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Mao Tse-tung, "On the Correct Treatment of Contradictions Among the People", op. cit. p. 118.

[20] Mao Tse-tung, "Speech at the National Conference of the CP of China on Propaganda Work", 1957, reprint

Peking 1968, p. 26.

[21] Ibid., p. 29.

[22] Ibid., p. 29.

[23] Mao Tse-tung, "On the Correct Treatment of Contradictions Among the People", op. cit. p. 130

[24] Mao Tse-tung, "Speech at the National Conference of the CP of China on Propaganda Work", op. cit. p. 31

[25] Mao Tse-tung, "On the Correct Treatment of Contradictions Among the People", op. cit. p. 132

[26] Ndreci Plasari, "The Class Struggle in the Party Is the Guarantee That the Party Will Always Remain a Revolutionary Party of the Working Class", in: "Albania Today" 1/1978. See also "Der Weg der Partei" 3/78.

[27] Mao Tse-tung, quoted in: "The Rulers...", "Honqi" No. 6/1976

[28] Ibid.

[29] "Report to the 10th Party Congress of the CP of China", in: "The 10th Party Congress of the CP of China", Documents, p. 19

[30] Mao Tse-tung, quoted from "Peking Review" 14/1976, p. 5.

[31] Mao Tse-tung, quoted from "Peking Review" 14/1976, p. 3.

[32] "Peking Review" No. 15/1976, p. 3

[33] Ibid.

[34] V.I. Lenin, quoted by Stalin in: "Foundations of Leninism", Works, vol. 6, p. 163.

[35] J.V. Stalin, "Foundations of Leninism", Works, vol. 6, p. 162.

[36] Mao Tse-tung, "On the Correct Treatment of Contradictions Among the People", op. cit. p. 106

[37] On the shortcomings that were already noticeable in the CPSU during Stalin's lifetime and which were later exploited by the Khrushchev revisionists, see Enver Hoxha's article: "The Struggle of the Working Class in the Revisionist Countries", in: Enver Hoxha, "Selected Speeches and Essays", Dortmund 1974, p. 125.

[38] "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", op. cit. p. 47.

[39] Ibid.

[40] "The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement", Peking 1965, p. 198.

[41] "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", op. cit. p. 11.

[42] Ibid., p. 8.

[43] "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", op. cit. p. 43.

[44] "The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement", Peking 1965, p. 75.

[45] Enver Hoxha, quoted in: "History of the PLA", Tirana 1971, p. 591.

[46] "Why Khrushchev Stepped Down From the Stage", Peking 1964, p. 18

[47] "Carrying the Struggle Against Khrushchev's Revisionism to its End", Peking 1965, p. 16.

[48] Enver Hoxha, Contribution to a Conversation with Chou En-lai, in: "Albania Today" 5/77, p. 53. See also "Der Weg der Partei" 5/77.

[49] J.V. Stalin, "Economic Problems of Socialism", Works, vol. 15, p. 340.

[50] Mao Tse-tung, "On the Ten Great Relationships", op. cit. p. 11.

[51] J.V. Stalin, "Economic Problems of Socialism", op. cit. p. 275.

[52] See the following articles of Stalin's: "Dizzy with Success", in which he criticizes bureaucratic methods in the implementation of collectivization in agriculture as well as leftist exaggerations; "Reply to the Comrade Collective Peasants", in which Stalin criticizes the fact that measures directed against the kulaks were also applied to middle peasants; "Report to the 16th Party Congress", in which Stalin reveals that the exaggerations in collectivization are in the tradition of Trotskyism. All articles in: Works, vol. 12.

[53] "History of the CPSU(B), Short Course", p. 378.

[54] See Stalin's "Report to the 18th Party Congress of the CPSU(B)", "The Further Consolidation of the CPSU(B)", Works, vol. 14, p. 212.

[55] "Refutation of the So-Called Unity of Action of the New Leadership of the CPSU(B)", Peking 1973, p. 27.

[56] Mao Tse-tung, "Declaration in Support of the Just Patriotic Struggle of the People of Panama against US Imperialism", Peking 1966.

[57] New Year's message from "Renmin Ribao", "Honqi" and "Jiefangjun Bao", Peking Review 1/1972.

[58] Enver Hoxha, "Contribution to a Conversation with Chou En-lai", in: "Albania Today" 5/77.